UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/624,015	07/21/2003	Zhong Jin Yang	LUC-425/Yang 20-11	5717

32205 7590 09/02/2005

PATTI & BRILL
ONE NORTH LASALLE STREET
44TH FLOOR
CHICAGO, IL 60602

EXAMINER	
PHAN, HUY Q	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2687	

DATE MAILED: 09/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/624,015	YANG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Huy Q. Phan	2687	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 July 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-8 and 11-16* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-8 and 11-16* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This Office Action is in response to Amendment filed on date: 07/29/2005.

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 11-16 are still pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 07/29/2005 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 2 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 2 is not written in completed form. Appropriate correction is required.

For examining purpose, it is assumed that the amended claim 2 being the same as the original claim 2.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jiang et al. (US-2004/0120494) in view of Larsen (US-2004/0151292).

Regarding claim 1, Jiang et al. disclose an automated method ("software made"; see [0005]) for correlating call data associated with one call from separate call detail records associated with the calling and called parties in which at least one of the parties is a wireless user in a wireless telecommunication network (figs. 1-3 and descriptions) comprising the steps of:

accessing a first detail call record (fig. 3, MSC 102) associated with one of the calling and called parties ([0028]-[0038]; for more detail see figs. 1-3 and descriptions);

ascertaining the identity of the other of the calling and called parties (fig. 1, user 110) from the first call detail record ("a database look up for user 110"; see [0030]);

determining if the one party (fig. 1, user 108) subscribes to a first feature based on information contained in the first detail record (see [0028]-[0030]; in order to determine that "the user 108 is the service subscriber");

accessing a second call detail record (fig. 3, MSC 106) associated with the other of the calling and called parties for the first call where the second call detail record (fig. 3, MSC 106; for more details see [0021]-[0038]) is stored independent of the storage of the first call detail record (fig. 3, MSC 102; for more details see [0021]-[0038]);

determining if the other party (fig. 1, user 110) subscribes to a predetermined feature base on information contained in the first and second detail record ([0028]-[0030]; for more details see figs. 1-3 and descriptions);

determining if a predetermined correlation exists for the first call based on whether the one party subscribes to the first feature and the other party subscribes to the predetermined feature base on information contained in the first and the second call detail records ([0028]-[0038]; for more details see figs. 1-3 and descriptions). But, Jiang et al. fail to expressly teach call related data stored in records for previously completed calls. However in analogous art, Larsen teaches call related data stored in records for previously completed calls described as "*The platform routes an eligible call to or from the subscriber through the switch and a telephony signal system, creates a call detail record and updates subscriber information in the database upon completion of the call*" (see abstract; for more details see specification). Since, Jiang et al. and Larsen are related to the method for communications system; therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Jiang et al. as taught by Larsen for purpose of keeping the user information updated in order for the system processing the future call faster.

Regarding claim 2, Jiang et al. and Larsen disclose the automated method according to claim 1. Jiang et al. further disclose wherein the first call record is stored at a first location associated with a first switch (fig. 1, MSC 102) that supports the one of the calling (fig. 1, user 108) and called parties, and the second call record is stored at a second location associated with a second switch (fig. 1, MSC 106) that supports the other of the calling and called parties (fig. 1, user 110).

Regarding claim 4, Jiang et al. and Larsen disclose the automated method according to claim 1. Jiang et al. further disclose wherein the step of accessing the second call detail record comprises transmitting a query from a correlation measurement node to another node in which the second call detail record is stored ([0021]-[0027]; also see [0042]-[0046]).

Regarding claim 5, Jiang et al. and Larsen disclose the automated method according to claim 4. Jiang et al. further disclose wherein the step of determining if the other party subscribes to the predetermined feature comprises receiving a reply message at the correlation measurement node in response to said query of the another node, the reply message containing data indicating whether the other party subscribes to the predetermined feature (see [0031]; "send a message to SCP 114"; also see fig.1 and its description).

Regarding claim 6, Jiang et al. and Larsen disclose the automated method according to claim 4. Jiang et al. further disclose wherein the step of determining if the other party subscribes to the predetermined feature comprises receiving a reply message at the correlation measurement node in response to said query of the another node, the reply message indicating that information is not currently available as to whether the other party subscribed to the predetermined feature [0003], the step of accessing the second call detail record further comprising transmitting another query from the correlation measurement node to a database that stores information on

features subscribed to by wireless users (see fig.1 and its description), receiving another reply message at the correlation measurement node in response to the another query ([0021]-[0027]; also see [0042]-[0046]), the another reply message containing data indicating whether the other party subscribes to the predetermined feature (see [0031]; "send a message to SCP 114"; also see fig.1 and its description).

Regarding claim 13, Jiang et al. and Larsen disclose the automated method according to claim 1. Larsen shows further comprising the step of modifying the first call detail record to indicate that the other party subscribed to the predetermined feature if it is determined that the predetermined correlation exists for the first call based on whether the one party subscribes to the first feature and the other party subscribes to the predetermined feature (see [0043]-[0049]).

Regarding claim 14, Jiang et al. and Larsen disclose the automated method according to claim 13. Larsen shows further wherein the step of modifying the first call detail record to indicate that the other party subscribed to the predetermined feature is implemented where the first feature and the predetermined feature are the same feature (see [0043]-[0049]).

6. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jiang et al. and Larsen in view of Petrakos et al. (US-2001/0053706).

Regarding claim 7, Jiang et al. and Larsen disclose the automated method according to claim 1. But, Jiang et al. and Larsen do not particularly show wherein the step of determining if a predetermined correlation exists comprises determining if both of the following conditions are true: the first party subscribed to the first feature at the time of the first call; and the second party subscribed to the predetermined feature at the time of the first call. However in analogous art, Petrakos et al. teach wherein the step of determining if a predetermined correlation exists comprises determining if both of the following conditions are true: the first party subscribed to the first feature at the time of the first call ([0024], for more details see figs. 1-4 and their descriptions); and the second party subscribed to the predetermined feature at the time of the first call ([0028], for more details see figs. 1-4 and their descriptions). Since, Jiang et al., Larsen and Petrakos et al. are related to the communication network; therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Jiang et al. and Larsen as taught by Petrakos et al. for purpose of allowing advantageously the system with capability in processing the signal information for determining the billing, available service and service control procedure.

7. Claims 8, 11, 12, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elliott et al. (US-5,768,352) in view of Jiang et al. (US-2004/0120494) and further in view of Larsen (US-2004/0151292).

Regarding claim 8, Elliott et al. disclose an automated method ("computer processing system"; see col. 1, lines 13-16) for obtaining statistical information based

on calls in a telecommunication network (fig. 2 and its description) comprising the steps of:

determining for one call if a first user (fig. 2, user 10) subscribes to a first predetermined call feature ("800 and 900 number" see col. 3, lines 26-51 and fig. 6, lines 52-65);

determining for the one call if a second user subscribes to a second predetermined call feature based on information contained in a second call detail record (col. 3, line 66-col. 4, line 4);

repeating the above steps for other calls (col. 3, line 52-col. 4, line 4);

maintaining a count of the calls in which both of the above determining steps are true and comparing said count with the total number of calls to generate said statistical information (col. 3, line 52-col. 4, line 4).

But, Elliott et al. do not particularly show the automated method for a wireless telecommunication network and determining for one previously completed call between a first wireless user and second user if the first wireless user subscribes to a first predetermined call feature based on information contained in a first call detail record associated with said one call where said first call detail record represents one of call origination and call termination; identifying a second call detail recode associated with said one call based on information contained in a first call detail record, said second call detail record being stored independent of storage of the call detail record and representing the other of call origination and call termination. However in analogous art, Jiang et al. teach the automated method ("software made"; see [0005]) for a wireless

telecommunication network (figs. 1-3 and descriptions) and determining for one call between a first wireless user and second user if the first wireless user subscribes to a first predetermined call feature based on information contained in a first call detail record (fig. 3, MSC 102) associated with said one call where said first call detail record represents one of call origination and call termination ([0028]-[0038]; for more detail see figs. 1-3 and descriptions); identifying a second call detail recode (fig. 3, MSC 106; for more details see [0021]-[0038]) associated with said one call based on information contained in a first call detail record (fig. 3, MSC 102; for more details see [0021]-[0038]), said second call detail record being stored independent of storage of the call detail record and representing the other of call origination and call termination ([0028]-[0030]; for more details see figs. 1-3 and descriptions). Since, Elliott et al. and Jiang et al. are related to the communication network; therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Elliott et al. as taught by Jiang et al. for purpose of offering advantageously the wireless technology into the communication system.

But, Elliott et al. and Jiang et al. fail to expressly teach call related data stored in records for previously completed calls. However in analogous art, Larsen teaches call related data stored in records for previously completed calls described as "*The platform routes an eligible call to or from the subscriber through the switch and a telephony signal system, creates a call detail record and updates subscriber information in the database upon completion of the call*" (see abstract; for more details see specification). Since, Elliott et al., Jiang et al. and Larsen are related to the method for

communications system; therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Elliott et al. and Jiang et al. as taught by Larsen for purpose of keeping the user information updated in order for the system processing the future call faster.

Regarding claim 11, Elliott et al., Jiang et al. and Larsen disclose the automated method according to claim 8. Jiang et al. further disclose wherein the step of determining for the one call if the second user subscribes to the second predetermined call feature comprises transmitting a query from a correlation measurement node to another node in which the second call detail record is stored ([0021]-[0027]; also see [0042]-[0046]).

Regarding claim 12, Elliott et al., Jiang et al. and Larsen disclose the automated method according to claim 11. Jiang et al. further disclose wherein the step of determining for the one call if the second user subscribes to the second predetermined call feature comprises receiving a reply message at the correlation measurement node in response to said query of the another node, the reply message containing data indicating whether the second party subscribes to the second predetermined feature (see [0031]; "send a message to SCP 114"; also see fig.1 and its description).

Regarding claim 15, Elliott et al., Jiang et al. and Larsen disclose the automated method according to claim 8. Larsen shows further comprising the step of modifying the

first call detail record to indicate that the other party subscribed to the predetermined feature if it is determined that the predetermined correlation exists for the first call based on whether the one party subscribes to the first feature and the other party subscribes to the predetermined feature (see [0043]-[0049]).

Regarding claim 16, Elliott et al., Jiang et al. and Larsen disclose the automated method according to claim 15. Larsen shows further wherein the step of modifying the first call detail record to indicate that the other party subscribed to the predetermined feature is implemented where the first feature and the predetermined feature are the same feature (see [0043]-[0049]).

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Huy Q Phan whose telephone number is 571-272-7924. The examiner can normally be reached on 8AM-6PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kincaid G Lester can be reached on 571-272-7922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Huy Phan

SONNY TRINH
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner: Phan, Huy Q. AU: 2687 Date: 08/20/2005